

VERT'E.076A

Serial No. 10/059,682

Response to Office Action dated April 18, 2006

PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 16-19 and 27-32 are in the case. Claims 27 and 28 have been amended.

In Paragraph 1 of the Office Action, claims 27-32 were rejected because claim 28 lacked proper antecedent basis, required by 35 U.S.C. §112, for the phrase "the gap." Claims 27 and 28 have hereby been amended to resolve the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection. Independent claim 28 has been amended to say "a gap" and dependent claim 27 says "the gap."

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action states claims 2, 4-6, 9, 10 and 16-19 stand allowed.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action states claims 27-32 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claims 27 and 28 have been amended to overcome the rejection.

It is believed that all grounds for rejection have been obviated, and claims 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 16-19 and 27-32 are in condition for allowance.

WOLF, BLOCK, SCHORR &amp; SOLIS-COHEN LLP



BY: BRIAN L. BELLES

Reg. No. 51,322

11/14/06

Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis Cohen LLP  
1650 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215 977-2127 - telephone  
215 504-3727 - facsimile